

# MINUTES

## Lane Economic Committee

Lane Council of Governments – 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Large Conference Room  
99 E. Broadway, Suite 400 – Eugene

January 26, 2004 – 11:30 A.M.

**PRESENT:** John Tamulonis, Chair; Tim Black, Chuck Forster, Anna Morrison, Jim Ramseyer, Rob Scoggin, John Sullivan, Mitch Wilkinson, members; Jay Bozievich, Philip Hudspeth, Kari Westlund, *ex officio* members; Mike Galvin (for Hal Reed), Joshua Greene (for Lynnette Wikstrom-Smith), Howard Schesser, Don Hampton, Ron Teninty (for Charles Spencer), alternate members.

Steve Dignam (LCOG); Peter Thurston (Lane County); Mimi Swartz, (Oregon Economic & Community Development Department), Gloria Perez, (USFS).

**ABSENT:** Mike Blomme, DeAnn Cherbas, Glenda Poling, Hal Reed, Charles Spencer, Mike Sullivan, Lynnette Wikstrom-Smith,

**GUESTS:** Wendy Farley, Tom Kartrude, Roger McCorkle, Erika Palmer, Tim Shinabarger, Jay Smiley, Kathy Smith, Diane Wiley, Michelle Wygle

In the absence of Mr. Tamulonis and Mr. Reed, Mr. Scoggin called the meeting of the Lane Economic Committee (LEC) to order at 11:30 a.m. He invited those who were present to introduce themselves. He welcomed Philip Hudspeth and Mitch Wilkinson as new members.

### 1. Approval of Minutes

Ms. Morrison requested that grammatical and spelling errors on pages 2 and 4 of the minutes of the December 15 meeting be corrected.

*Mr. Scoggin determined there was consensus to accept the minutes, as corrected.*

Mr. Scoggin determined there was no one present wishing to make public comment and that there were no remarks to be made by the Chair and Staff.

### 2. University of Oregon Economic Development Update

Kathy Smith described the purpose of a business incubator to be to provide supportive environments for the growth and commercialization of start-up and early stage companies. She reported that the University of Oregon (UO) had received an Oregon Lottery grant to conduct a feasibility analysis and prepare a business plan for one or more business incubators in Lane County.

Mr. Tamulonis joined the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

Diane Wiley referred to a document entitled “Feasibility Study Findings for Business Incubation Opportunities in Lane County” distributed at the beginning of the meeting. She said the feasil-

ity study was conducted by Claggett Wolfe Associates, a consulting firm with extensive business incubation experience. She reviewed general findings of the study reported in the document that supported and raised questions about establishing a Lane County Business Incubation project. She also reviewed assets/opportunities and challenges specifically related to manufacturing, technology, arts, and specialty foods/agribusiness sectors in the county that were identified.

Ms. Smith described the work of the Lane County Business Incubator Group advisory committee overseeing the feasibility study. She said it had directed her firm, K.J. Smith Associates, to prepare an action-oriented business plan built on the recommendations of the study to concentrate on the possibilities of business incubators for the manufacturing and technology sectors.

Ms. Smith said the plan would address the critical linkages needed to make a business incubation project successful. She said it would include a draft mission and goals statement, identification of programs and services needed, propose organizational structure, make recommendations on facilities, staffing and a preliminary budget, and identify potential funding sources.

Members discussed the report at length – the feasibility and possible location of an incubator project, funding issues, positive and negative factors in addressing various business sectors, examples of other incubator projects, and possible participants in a business incubator.

### **3. Needs and Issues Process**

Mr. Dignam reported that the State of Oregon had determined that the “2004 Needs and Issues Ranking Process” would begin February 1. He referred to his January 26 memorandum regarding the process and the involvement of the LEC. He reviewed changes that had been made which were intended to make the process operate more efficiently, as follows:

1. Notify interested parties of the process through e-mail.
2. Refer potential project applicants to the State of Oregon web site for necessary forms.
3. Refer interested potential applicants to the State of Oregon web site for instructions.
4. Refer the LEC subcommittee tasked with doing a detailed review of the projects to the State of Oregon web site, rather than photocopying all projects.
5. Limit local project sponsors to a maximum of 5 total projects, rather than performing the extensive data entry and handling of up to 24 projects from one sponsor as occurred last year.

Mimi Swartz stated that she was manager of the Needs and Issues Process for the State of Oregon. She explained that though the LEC could limit the number of projects from a single sponsor that it would consider, there was no limit on the number that could be submitted. She said sponsors would need to prioritize projects submitted to inform the LEC which should be evaluated in its process.

Ms. Swartz explained that there were currently over 6,000 projects on the State List. She said many agencies would not fund projects that had not been submitted to the process. Mr. Dignam added that submitting a project application had never been a guarantee that it would be funded.

Mr. Sullivan said he did not believe sponsors should to submit a large number of project applications because the funding for all project was limited.

Tom Kartrude said the Port of Siuslaw currently had nine projects on the Oregon Needs and Issues list because federal lobbyists had informed them that they were unable to encourage funding for a project if it was not on such a list. He said he had no objection to asking project sponsors to rank its applications, but he did not believe the number of applications should be limited.

Ms. Morrison said lobbying by other groups such as the “United Front” from Lane County were not bound by such restrictions. She said she believed project sponsors needed to be realistic about the possibility of receiving funding. She said it was her opinion that at least a majority of the 6,000 projects currently on the Oregon Needs and Issues List were not viable.

Mr. Teninty suggested that “project viability” be a criterion for accepting project applications.

Mr. Tamulonis said he considered the Needs and Issues List to be a way problems in a community were identified. He said limiting the number of applications that a sponsor could submit would limit its ability to do long-range planning.

Mr. Dignam suggested that since the time for adjourning the meeting was a hand, a subcommittee be formed to complete the discussion of the proposed changes to the Lane County Needs and Issues process and approve their implementation.

***Mr. Tamulonis moved, seconded by Ms. Morrison, to adopt the changes to the Lane County Needs and Issues process as proposed, with the exception that Number 5 be changed to state that the LEC would review and rank only five projects from any sponsor, but that the number of projects a sponsor could submit through the State of Oregon web site was not limited. The motion was adopted, 10:1, with Ms. Morrison voting no.***

#### **4. Tourism Summit Summary**

Ms. Westlund stated there had been a “tourism summit” in Lane County. She said she would present a summary of its results at the next LEC meeting.

Mr. Dignam stated that the next meeting was scheduled for February 23, 2004

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

*(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)*